

THE PATRIOT.

Houston Mississippi.

J. A. ORR, Editor.

August 29, 1849.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINEES.

For Governor.

Gen. JOHN A. QUITMAN.

For Secretary of State.

SAMUEL STAMPS.

For Treasurer.

RICHARD GRIFFITH.

For Auditor.

G. T. SWANN.

For Attorney General.

D. C. GLENN.

For Congress.

W. S. FEATHERSTON.

For the Legislature.

T. N. MARTIN.

W. K. HARRISON.

NOTICE.

There will be a mass meeting of both political parties, at this place on the 1st Saturday (1st day) in Sept. to appoint delegates to the Central Convention that is to assemble at Jackson in October next. This convention has been recommended by many worthy, and patriotic gentlemen of both parties, to devise and concentrate the people of Mississippi upon a course of policy to resist Northern aggression upon Southern Rights.

Election Returns.

Cheering News from Indiana.

Democratic Governor and Lieutenant Governor, elected by from

Ten to Twenty Thousand majority. Legislature largely Democratic; and eight out of ten Congressmen. This is a Democratic gain of two since 1847.

NORTH CAROLINA—Whigs have elected to Congress, Clingman, Stanley, Deberry, Caldwell, Shepherd, and Outlaw. The Democrats have elected Ashe, Venable, and Daniel.

ALABAMA—Harris, Inge, Hubbard, Cobb, and Bowden. Democrats, and Alston, and Hilliard, whigs elected to Congress. The Democrats have a majority on joint ballot in the Legislature.

TENNESSEE—Andrew Johnson, J. H. Savage, George W. Jones, James H. Thomas, Andrew Ewing, J. H. Harris and F. P. Stanton, Democrats and Watkins, Anderson, Gentry, and Williams, have been elected to Congress. The Democrats have a majority on joint ballot in the Legislature.

KENTUCKY—Boyd, Mason, Stanton, and Caldwell, Democrats, and Thompson, McLean, Johnson, Marshall, Beck and Moorehead, Whigs, elected to Congress. No emancipationists elected to the Legislature.

Let it not be forgotten that Saturday is the day appointed for the Slavery meeting; we hope to see a large turn out. The communication of "Union" on that subject, was received the moment our paper was going to press. We regret it exceedingly, as the question seems to be fully understood by the pen of Union and his communication would have been servicable in view of the coming meeting.

Hon. W. S. Featherston, and W. L. Harris, Esq. commence filling their appointments at West Point, Lowndes county, on the 30th inst.—They will speak at Palo Alto, on Saturday the 1st September at Houston, on Monday the 3d, at Old Town, on Thursday the 6th, and at Hopewell on Saturday the 8th.

Want of space prevents us from noticing the Republican's defense of Clayton.—We will give it such notice as it deserves, next week.

Col. Herbert, candidate for Circuit Judge, of this District, passed through this place a few days since, on his way to the western counties.

Does the Republican approve the Missouri Compromise? We suspect from some of his editorials that he is unwilling to stand by the Compromise.

Who schemed the annexation of Texas for the purpose of strengthening slavery, knowing that its only effect would be, to exasperate the North, and bring the whole slave question once more into the vortex of politics?—Hillyer

We quoted the above sentiment in our paper of the 8th inst. with the following comment, (to wit.)

This sentiment comes from the editor of the Aberdeen Independent—a New York Yankee, who was a sub-elect in the canvass of 1844, in New York. He has come to the South but from this declaration, we infer that he has not adopted southern notions on the slavery question. Further comment is unnecessary.

Hillyer replies on the 11th Inst. by charging us with coining or copying falsehoods, and denounces our inferences as being untrue.

Very well. Let's see where the falsehood rests.

Our first assertion was, that this sentiment (who schemed &c.) came from the editor of the Aberdeen Independent. We repeat the charge and say that Hillyer is its responsible author. PROOF. We find it unnecessarily dragged into the reply of the Editor, to Gen Davis's card, which he has since repeatedly recognised as his. Well so far upon whom rests the falsehood? Giles M. Hillyer.

Our next assertion was that he was a New York Yankee. Who are recognized to be Yankees, by the whole southern people? Those who come from the north. Where did he come from? From the North, as we are assured and as we verily believe from New York. Well thus far upon whom rests the falsehood? Giles M. Hillyer.

Our next assertion was that he was a sub-elect in the canvass of 1844. This assertion we had repeatedly heard—had seen him questioned as a sub-elect in the columns of a newspaper, and had never heard it contradicted specifically, by any one, not even Hillyer himself until the 11th Inst. He had issued one or two numbers before he denied it through his paper. With these lights before us, we had the right to take it for granted that he had really been a sub-elect. Virtually he admitted it, as it is a principle universally regarded as correct, in law where a charge is made against an individual in his presence and he fails to contradict it, the charge is assumed to be correct. But he denies it now after it had been repeatedly preferred against him and if we receive his assertion for truth, it merely convinces us that he was a much smaller man where he came from, than we were disposed to give him credit for being.

Our next assertion was that he had come south.

Surely by the denial of this assertion, he does not mean to say that he is a Southerner by birth—that he had never been from the South.—Then if our second assertion is correct, the last is equally correct.—And this throws the falsehood from us. Where does it fall? Upon the censor editor.

The next is our inference, that he had not adopted southern notions on the slavery question.

The sentiment from which we drew our inference directly, as we distinctly avowed was this: "Who schemed the annexation of Texas for the purpose of STRENGTHENING SLAVERY KNOWING THAT ITS ONLY EFFECT WOULD BE TO EXASPERATE THE NORTH, and bring the whole slave question once more into the vortex of politics?"

The two facts present themselves; what are Southern notions and what are Hillyer's notions on the slavery question?

Now the sentiment above quoted contains the notions upon which turns the issue between Hillyer and ourselves.

What were southern notions upon the annexation of Texas? Every man in the South who heard the discussion during the canvass of 44 is aware that, that measure was regarded by its advocates, as a great accession of strength to the South on the slavery question. There was no

thing disreputable or criminal in her thus to strengthen herself by annexing slave territory and a slave State to the United States. She regarded the "scheme" favorably. Eight southern States—(viz)—Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Missouri, and Arkansas voted for the "scheme." This fully indicates what "Southern notions" were on the slavery question in reference to the annexation of Texas. Now let us contrast them with Hillyer's. He denies that it would strengthen slavery—that it could have no other effect than to exasperate the North—that by this act of annexation, its friends are to be held responsible for the excitement that now pervades the Union on slavery—that the friends of annexation are agitators, in as much as this question had been settled but the annexation of Texas brought it "into the vortex of politics,"—that by this act the leaders of the Southern Democracy, became unfit for "the south to rally upon" in this great slavery excitement.

These are Hillyer's notions on the slavery question. Now let us ask our readers how they compare with true sound southern notions? Is there not a striking contrast between them? Is our inference untrue?

Having now fully, and satisfactorily substantiated our charges, and inferences, we hurl back the imputation of falsehood, upon this infamous creature—the censor editor, with the most ineffectual and unmitigated contempt. What he charges upon us, he has basely and maliciously done himself. When we made the few remarks, which were published in our paper of the 8th Inst., we did not intend again to refer to the free soil opinions of this Yankee. We intended passing over them without further comment, impressed with the belief that the sentiment to which we referred, would strike with force the minds of Mississippians, and arouse their honest indignation against one, who has the temerity to come among southerners, to deal out the devilish doctrines of the abominable free soil party. But he has provoked this article, and he is responsible for the consequences, (be them what they may) growing out of it.

We have merely given the positions of this censor editor, without commenting upon them. We propose now to investigate them.

He treats the annexation of Texas by the "leaders of the Southern Democracy" as something highly criminal. That it was presumption and arrogance in them to advocate any measure, calculated to strengthen slavery, knowing (as he says,) that its only effect would be to exasperate the north—that they willfully, and knowingly, have been the cause of this great slavery excitement—that they are the agitators—that the slavery question, before the annexation of Texas, was settled. The slavery question settled before the annexation of Texas!!! Every one, knows this to be false. Every one, knows that the abolitionists were daily gaining ground at the North. Every one, knows that prior to the annexation of Texas, the South was bedeviled incessantly and continually in Congress by abolition petitions, and of the efforts of John Quincy Adams, Giddings, and other abolitionists, were making to repeal the 21st Rule that excluded abolition petitions. Every body knows that the storm was gathering, and thickening hourly at the North. Every body, saw the dark black cloud of fanaticism that had risen, and was threatening to break forth in wild commotion upon this once glorious Union of ours. We saw ourselves in a minority, soon to be at the mercy of a reckless and cruel despotism, and when we under the first promptings of nature and reason, begin to look around for assistance, and talk of the annexation of Texas as a "scheme," by which we might strengthen ourselves this man having the control of a Southern journal, has the brazen faced audacity in our very midst—around our very hearthstones, to taunt the leaders of the Southern Democracy, with having

set the elements of that storm in motion,—that they have been the cause of all this alarm, and that our great patriotic leaders of the Southern Democracy—leaders that have guided our forces in triumph through many a blood stained field of carnage—that "they are not the men for the South to rally upon." Why? Are they "untrue" to the south? Have they even shrunk from doing their whole duty as men and patriots, to the South and to the constitution? While the devouring flames of fanaticism are consuming and withering to ashes the proud temple of Liberty, are they to stand listless with folded arms, and make no effort to rescue the mild Goddess? Yes, it is clear that, that man imagining his professions to the South to be sincere "is but a renegade against the country he betrayed" would doubtless exult with demagogical joy in having you to believe that the leaders of the Southern Democracy are not the men for you to rally upon.

They have spoken in trumpet tones their devotion to our cause through the Southern Address, not only to the South but to this great nation—they have developed their plans of generalship to save our happy SOUTH. That Address embodies their views—they are for the good of the South—the names of the best and most virtuous Patriots on earth have been affixed to it—the leaders of the Southern Democracy have put it forth.

It is not strange or unexpected that one of northern lineage and of so recent a transplanting, should raise his voice of warning to the Southern people, not to rally upon men who have thus proven themselves true to the South, and have continually watched with a jealous eye our rights and interests. It would doubtless best suit the honest notions of northern men to see the South rally upon the free soil platform of the northern party.

But the censor editor prates about exasperating the north. This is the spirit of his sentiment. You of the South, insignificant inferior creatures must be careful not to "exasperate the North"—be careful not to rouse the sleeping lion—make no effort to strengthen and brace yourselves for the contest it will surely exasperate the north." Bow in meekness to the imperious dictates and demands of the anti-slavery party or you will "exasperate the North. Talk not of your unalienable rights under the constitution—and of your determination to maintain that instrument.

Can we listen to this language without its creating in our minds a spirit of indignation against him whose doctrines lead us into these inconsistencies? In conclusion we present a figure. The "leaders of the South. Democracy," are in favor of the Southern address. True some of them refused to affix their signatures and others thought it unnecessary, but we speak of the great body of the Southern Democracy and their leaders. The censor editor tells us that they "are not the men for the south to rally upon."—They have indicated their course and Hillyer attempts to weaken that course by weakening our confidence in them, thereby creating a disunion of sentiment among the southern people.

It was difficult for the mighty armies of Caesar to conquer the Gauls and to accomplish it the more readily he devised the stratagem of exciting two of the provinces of Gaul the Aedui and the Sequani, against each other. The controversy waxed warm between them so that they easily became the prey of the conqueror.—When the South has been divided on this subject, it does not require a keen foresight to read the history of despotism in our ruined fortunes.

The weather for two weeks has been exceedingly warm, and dry—from the 18th to the 25th inst the thermometer ranged at from 93 to 97

Andrew Ewing, is a Free Soiler. Republican 18th inst.

His election was caused by the whigs.—Republican 25th inst.

Ergo, the whigs of Tennessee (according to the Republican) favor ending Free Soilers to Congress.

We find in the Columbus Democrat of the 18th inst., an extraordinary correspondence between Wm. L. Harris, Esq. (the whig candidate for Congress, in this District) and W. T. Barry, Esq. in reference to Mr. Barry's filling Col. Featherston's appointments with Mr. Harris.

The facts as set forth in the correspondence, are these: Mr. Barry had been requested to fill Col. Featherston's appointments, during his temporary absence, & had consented to do so. Mr. Harris declined alternating with Mr. Barry in the order of discussion, unless Col. Featherston would beforehand, endorse Barry's "acts, declarations, and opinions." Barry of course refused to fill the appointments, unless he could be placed on terms of equality as to the length of time allowed, and the succession of his speeches with Mr. Harris. It will be remembered that those appointments were made jointly, by the two candidates for Congress. The untimely death of a beloved wife, prevented Col. Featherston from attending the contemplated discussion, with Mr. Harris, and Mr. Barry was requested to take his place, (i.e.) to represent the Democratic party, at appointments jointly made; and over which Col. Featherston had an equal control with Mr. Harris.

It was an unheard of demand of Mr. Harris, in requiring the endorsement of Mr. Barry's "acts, declarations, and opinions" from Col. Featherston. When that demand was refused by Mr. Barry, he ceased to recognize him as a representative of the party and extended to him not the least courtesy at Columbus.—spoke all day to weary out the patience of his hearers, that the censor Barry might not have the opportunity to reply,—posted off to Noxubee county, in Col. F's. absence and filled alone the joint appointments: Was this just? Was it right? or was it not highly censurable thus to take advantage of Col. Featherston's distress? Did not common humanity, much less a high souled magnanimity require of Mr. Harris to desist from the appointments for public discussion. We think the course of Mr. Harris very unfair, in thus continuing the appointments against the wishes of his opponent, and tends to make more reprehensible the unreasonable demand from Mr. Barry, to speak first and as long as he saw proper.

What are and ever have been the rules of discussion with public speakers in Mississippi. Has it not been the universal custom by both parties to award equal advantages as to length of time allowed, and the succession of their speeches? What was the mainly course of Col. Featherston during his own canvass two years ago. He met in public discussion many gentlemen who were not his opponents and in every single instance, he allowed to them an equal length of time, and alternated with them regularly. Never did he once make the unreasonable demand of those who met with him for discussion, to endorse the "acts, declarations, and opinions," of Colonel McClung.

Certainly Mr. Harris should have extended that sheer courtesy to an honorable opponent; so far as not to have demanded the unreasonable concession from Barry, to yield the first and a four and a half hours speech, or drive Col. F. into the canvass, in the dark hour of his deepest distress and affliction. We appeal to the magnanimity of this community,—of this District—to know whether the conduct of Mr. Harris, in this affair, under the melancholy circumstances, was either manly or generous?

It is true that he made the proposition on the 17th August to Col. F. after he had canvassed two counties, during his absence, to suspend the canvass until Col. F. was willing to go into it. That indeed was very liberal after public opinion had condemned the course of Mr. Harris in availing himself of the opportunity of addressing the people without the possibility of reply on the part of Col. F. Why was not that proposition made before Mr. Harris went to Noxubee. Why the necessity of thus feeling public opinion.

Dishonesty the cause of remorse.

Republicans. Ah, neighbor do you join the Republic in that cry? Was Andrew J. Edmondson as honest a man as the country affords, removed for dishonesty? Blair and Leland, and ten thousand of the same stamp guilty of dishonesty? Was Dickinson charged with dishonesty, that an Ohioan might depose him from the Post Office at Jackson? What have they been guilty of? What act of dishonesty have they been charged with? We call for the charges, specify them. If you cannot give them in your zeal to advance the interest of your party, remember when you make that charge that you assail the character of honest and respectable men. "Slander lives upon succession"; and the injury of such a charge is more reprehensible than the insult of their removals.

But since the Republican talks about dishonesty in officers, we call his attention to the appointment of a defaulter to the office of U.S. Attorney for the District of Texas, and are willing that our remarks above be applied with the strictest scrutiny to the charge. There is an immense difference in denouncing honest and dishonest men. Our remarks can only apply to men of unimpeachable integrity. It seems then that "the good policy of old Zack" develops itself, in the removal of such men as Blair, and Edmondson, and the appointment of such as Hughes, Fitz Henry Warren, and Houderbert. But the charge against Hughes; we copy from the Equal Rights.

"We recollect reading some time since, in one of the Washington City papers, the appointment of Robert Hughes, to the office of U.S. Attorney for the District of Texas, in place of Merryman removed.

And as Gen. Taylor said, that he would not appoint any but, honest and capable men to office, we suppose of course, that the party that placed Gen. Taylor in power, will not object to these tests, being applied to this gentleman.

1st. As to honesty, we believe that a committee appointed by the Legislature of this State has reported this same Robert Hughes, formerly a citizen of this State, a defaulter to the State in a large sum, perhaps some 8,000 or 10,000. We are also informed that he left his clients minus to a very large amount. So much for honesty.

2d. As to capacity, we are informed that this same Robert Hughes, spoke two hours in the Supreme court in this State, in the case in which he was interested, and one of the Judges—perhaps Judge Sharkey, asked him on which side of the cause he was arguing, not being able to comprehend from his lucid speech. So much for capacity.

3d. As to faithfulness. We have no doubt but Mr. Hughes will be quite faithful, in the collection of all monies due Uncle Sam, but he will be quite faithful to himself by putting it into his own pocket, and appropriating it to his own use as he did that collected for the State of Mississippi, and his other clients. What a commentary on the declaration of Gen. Taylor."

An unholy attempt to defame the character of an honest Man.

Gen. Taylor declared that he would be a no-party President, Mr. Clayton affirmed that he would adopt no infamous system of proscription, and Mr. Crittenden asserted that Gen. Taylor "loathed proscription." The old Gen. was elected to the Presidency with those solemn promises ringing upon him. How has he discharged them? But little more than five months have elapsed since he assumed the reins of Government, and the names of near

Two Thousand Officers, have been published in the list of "proscriptions." The masses have become indignant—Legislatures have spoken their disapprobation—the peoples murmuring through the ballot box, have been heard against this shameful recreancy to "party pledges," and we find the supporters of the administration, driven to the most desperate subterfuges to defend and apologize for the miserable misrule of the "Second Washington."

Unscrupulous in their vows and unscrupulous in breaking those vows, they are equally unscrupulous in slandering—defaming—and tradu-